

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

**BRIAN MEDLIN,**

\*

**Plaintiff,**

\*

**Civil Action No. RDB-19-0205**

**v.**

\*

**LAUREN BEITZEL, *et al.*,**

\*

**Defendants.**

\* \* \* \* \*

**ORDER**

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, filed suit against Defendants Lauren Beitzel, Bruce Liller, and Holly Pierce. (ECF No. 1.) Defendant Pierce filed a Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative, Motion for Summary Judgment on January 13, 2020. (ECF No. 31.) Plaintiff received a Rule 12/56 Notice, advising him of his right to file a response to the Defendant Pierce's motion within twenty-eight days, and if he did not file a written response, the Court would resolve the case based on the materials submitted by Defendant Pierce. (ECF No. 34.) On February 4, 2020, Defendant Pierce filed another Motion to Dismiss or, Alternatively, for Summary Judgment, supplementing, adopting and incorporating by reference the evidence and arguments set forth in the January 13, 2020 Motion. (ECF No. 37.) Again, Plaintiff received a Rule 12/56 Notice, advising him of his right to file a response to the Defendant Pierce's motion within twenty-eight days, and if he did not file a written response, the Court would resolve the case based on the materials submitted by Defendant Pierce. (ECF No. 38.)

On March 5, 2020, Defendants Beitzel and Liller filed a Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative, Motion for Summary Judgment. (ECF No. 41.) Plaintiff again received a Rule

12/56 Notice, advising him of his right to file a response to the Defendants' Motion to Dismiss within twenty-eight days, and if he did not file a written response, the Court would resolve the case based on the materials submitted by the Defendants. (ECF No. 42.) The Plaintiff having filed no response to any of Defendants' motions, it is HEREBY ORDERED THIS 13TH DAY OF APRIL that:

1. Defendant Pierce's Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 31) is DENIED AS MOOT;
2. Defendant Pierce's Motion to Dismiss or, Alternatively for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 37), adopting and incorporating by reference the evidence and arguments raised in ECF No. 31, treated as a motion to dismiss, is GRANTED;
3. Defendants Beitzel and Liller's Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative, Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 41), treated as a motion to dismiss, is GRANTED;
4. The Clerk of this Court SHALL CLOSE THIS CASE; and
5. The Clerk of the Court shall transmit a copy of this Order and accompanying Memorandum Opinion to counsel of record.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard D. Bennett  
United States District Judge